AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to FIG. 4, labeling it as "PRIOR ART" .

Attachment: Replacement sheet
Annotated sheet showing changes

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 are pending in this application, of which claims 1-2, 4 and 6 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

The Examiner has indicated that FIG. 4 should be labeled as "PRIOR ART". Accordingly, FIG. 4 has been so corrected.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for failure to show the following limitation cited in claim 2: "arc, cross, radial, circular, polygonal or spiral configuration."

Accordingly, claim 2 has been amended to delete this limitation.

Claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

Accordingly, the indefinite language in claims 2 and 6 have been amended to correct the noted instances of indefiniteness.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C.§112, second paragraph, rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent Publication US 2003/0058210 A1 to Yamazaki et al. (hereinafter "**Yamazaki et al.**")

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection

Yamazaki et al. discloses a display with high resolution and reduced image flicker. The driving method disclosed in this reference, or the field sequential driving method, divides one frame of image into a plurality of subframes, i.e., divides the period of one image frame into a plurality of subframe periods; displays red, green and blue images during the corresponding subframe periods; and, when these color images are to be displayed, turns on the corresponding red, green and blue backlights successively to feed light to the display section.

The Examiner has cited paragraph [0064] for teaching synchronizing of the LED's with an image signal, as recited in claim 1.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Paragraph [0064] discloses:

> After the writing of the digital video signals into the latch circuit **(1) 301-4** has finished, the digital video signals written into the latch circuit **(1) 301-4** are sent to and written into the latch circuit **(2) 301-5** at one time when a latch pulse flows through a latch pulse line connected to the latch circuit **(2) 301-5** in synchronism with the operation timing of the shift register circuit **301-2**.

This paragraph discloses no more than the writing of digital video signals into a latch circuit when the latch pulse flows ... in synchronism with the operation timing of the shift register circuit. This fails to disclose that the operation of the LEDs is synchronized with an image signal used to form an image on the image display means (LCD).

Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to clarify this distinction, and the 35 U.S.C.§102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over **Yamazaki et al.** in view of U.S. Patent 6,757,422 to Suzuki et al. (hereinafter "**Suzuki et al.**")

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Suzuki et al. has been cited for teaching a lenticular lens between light source 250 and LCD 210 but, like **Yamazaki et al.** discussed above, fails to teach, mention or suggest the limitations of claim 1, as amended, from which claims 2-4 depend.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C.§102(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over **Yamazaki et al.** in view of **Suzuki et al.** and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,936,774 to Street (hereinafter "**Street**").

Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection.

Street has been cited for teaching an autostereoscopic display which allows for multiple viewers, citing element 52 as the "multiple viewers."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Element 52 represents apertures placed on front of a conventional diffuse light source to provide light by transmission to a field lens 53, as disclosed in column 10, line 13-15.

Furthermore, **Street**, like the other cited references, fails to teach, mention or suggest the features recited in claim 1, from which claim 6 depends.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C.§103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over **Yamazaki et al.**

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted above, **Yamazaki et al.** fails to teach, mention or suggest the features of claim 1, as amended, from which claim 7 depends.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C.§103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-4, 6 and 7, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

Dated: January 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

William L. Brooks
Registration No.: 34,129
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
(202) 478-7370
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Attachments

Annotated Sheet
1 of 1

FIG.4

PRIOR ART